

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being cancelled.

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 10 are currently being amended.

No claims are currently being added.

This amendment and reply amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1, 3, 5-12 and 17-25 are pending in this application.

Indication of Allowable Subject Matter:

Applicant appreciates the indication in the Office Action that claims 9, 10, 17, 19, 20, 22 and 24 contain allowable subject matter. By way of this amendment and reply, presently pending claim 10 has been amended to place that claim in independent form to include the features of its base claim and any intervening claims. Thus, presently pending independent claim 10 is now in allowable form based on the indications made in the Office Action with respect to that claim.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the final Office Action, claims 1, 3, 5-8, 11, 12, 18, 21, 23 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by JP 09-205390 to Ozaki et al. These rejections are traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

Presently pending independent claim 1 now recites:

An adaptive array wireless terminal apparatus having a plurality of antennas, comprising:

a determining unit configured to determine reception levels of signals of a plurality of streams received by respective ones of said plurality of antennas;

a display unit configured to display said determined reception levels of signals of said plurality of streams; and

a reception level adjusting unit configured to be manually operated by a user and configured to adjust the reception levels of signals of said plurality of streams so that a difference in a reception signal level between said plurality of antennas before adaptive array processing can be reduced for improving the reception characteristics of the adaptive array processing.

The final Office Action makes the following assertions:

“Applicant(s) are reminded that the Examiner is entitled to give the broadest reasonable interpretation to the language of the claims. The Examiner is not limited to Applicant’s definition, which is not specifically set forth in the claims.”

*In response to applicant’s arguments that the references fail to show certain features of applicant’s invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., **to reduce a difference in a reception signal level between a plurality of antennas before adaptive array processing, for improving the reception characteristics of the adaptive array processing**) are not recited in the rejected claims(s).*

In reply, presently pending independent claims 1, 3 and 5 have been amended to specifically recite the feature highlighted in bold in the above paragraph, so that these feature must be given patentable weight.

Ozaki discloses calculating a correlation value of reception signals of two antennas 1 and 2 in a space diversity antenna. See, for example, paragraph 0007 of Ozaki. On the contrary, the present invention measures the actual reception signal levels received by a plurality of antennas (#1, #2) respectively, and uses the measured levels for display. More specifically, the present invention as explicitly recited in independent claims 1, 3 and 5 is provided to reduce a difference in a reception signal level between a plurality of antennas

before adaptive array processing, for improving the reception characteristics of the adaptive array processing. For that purpose, the present invention measures (or "determines", as recited in claim 1) the respective reception levels of a plurality of antennas.

As is clear from the above discussion, Ozaki is much different from the present invention as exemplified by the presently pending independent claims under rejection.

Therefore, presently pending independent claims 1, 3 and 5 patentably distinguish over the cited art of record.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the final Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

February 23, 2009

By

Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (202) 672-5300

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis

Registration No. 26,874

Phillip J. Articola

Registration No. 38,819